Ireland Dec 14

CEASE

YOUR FUNNING.

1799

K England. Appx
History & Politics II

THE UNION.

CEASE YOUR FUNNING.

by Charles Kendal Bushe Esq.

OH, THAT MINE ENEMY WOULD WRITE A BOOK!

DUBLIN, PRINTED:

LONDON, reprinted for J. DEBRETT, opposite Burlington House, Piccadilly.

1799.

CEASE YOUR FUNNING.

I LOVE wit as much as any man; but a joke may certainly ſometimes be carried too far. I have never ſubmitted to the juſtice of Lord Shafteſbury's fanciful poſition, that *ridicule is the teſt of truth*; and I own I think its application is peculiarly offenſive when political ſubjects of the deepeſt and moſt ſerious importance are treated with idle levity and buffoon irony. Theſe ſentiments have been principally excited by reading a pamphlet, entitled, ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN UNION CONSIDERED.—The author of this work has evidently written after the model of ſome of Swift's lighter compoſitions; a ſtyle which, in my apprehenſion, has never till now been ſucceſsfully imitated, though attempted with ſome talent by the ſuppoſed annotators of the late Alderman George Faulkner, and in ſome few other inſtances.

CEASE YOUR FUNNING.

I LOVE wit as much as any man; but a joke may certainly ſometimes be carried too far. I have never ſubmitted to the juſtice of Lord Shafteſbury's fanciful poſition, that *ridicule is the teſt of truth*; and I own I think its application is peculiarly offenſive when political ſubjects of the deepeſt and moſt ſerious importance are treated with idle levity and buffoon irony. Theſe ſentiments have been principally excited by reading a pamphlet, entitled, ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN UNION CONSIDERED.—The author of this work has evidently written after the model of ſome of Swift's lighter compoſitions; a ſtyle which, in my apprehenſion, has never till now been ſucceſsfully imitated, though attempted with ſome talent by the ſuppoſed annotators of the late Alderman George Faulkner, and in ſome few other inſtances.

This ſtyle conſiſts altogether in the art of ſupporting, in a ſtrain of grave irony, the oppoſite of the opinion which you mean to eſtabliſh. It is a good-humoured application of the argument called by logicians *argumentum ad abſurdum*; but whether it partakes more of jeſt or ſophiſm, I again proteſt againſt the uſe of either upon ſubjects of national importance and public concern. I ſhall briefly enumerate a few of the moſt prominent artifices by which the author of this work, who, I am convinced, is either a member of Oppoſition or an abſolute United Iriſhman, endeavours, by an affected recommendation of the meaſure, to cry down and depreciate the projected Union, the only chance of this country's ſalvation; premiſing that, in order to give a higher reliſh to his ridicule, he has had the addreſs to circulate a report, with very ſucceſsful induſtry, that the work in queſtion is the production of an Engliſh gentleman of conſiderable talents, who is an Iriſh member of parliament, and in high official ſituation in Dublin Caſtle. Indeed, ſuch has been the prevalence of this report, and ſo well ſimulated is the maſk aſſumed, that on the firſt peruſal I was ſcarcely able to diſtinguiſh whether the author was in earneſt or not; and I am credibly informed that to this hour ſeveral well-meaning people continue in the erroneous opinion that he was ſo.

I do not pretend to trace the progreſs of this facetious writer regularly from page to page, but ſhall point out a few of his topics which appear to me ſufficient to detect at once the duplicity of the ſtyle and the depth of the intention. He affects, with great appearance of gravity throughout the entire pamphlet, to denounce the exiſtence of the Iriſh Parliament as the cauſe of the late rebellion and invaſion; and he draws from theſe principles, once eſtabliſhed, an inevitable concluſion, that the return of ſuch calamities is only to be prevented by the annihilation of the cauſe of them. Here, indeed, *latet anguis in herbâ.* This is the very language of the United Iriſhmen. The ſame poſitions, the ſame inferences, are to be found faintly viſible in the ſpeeches of all the Oppoſition members in England and Ireland, and glaringly conſpicuous in every number of the *Preſs*, and *Union Star*; avowing themſelves in the confeſſions of Doctor M'Nevin, proclaiming themſelves in the manifeſtos of Arthur O'Connor. Is it not evident, then, that the author in queſtion is ſuch as I have deſcribed him? Is it not evident that, by inſidiouſly inferring the neceſſity of an Union from the corruption of the Iriſh Legiſlature, he in fact directs the attention of this deluded nation at one and the ſame moment to the pretence of a

Reform

Reform and the project of a Separation?—He never imputes the late calamities of this country to any thing but Parliament; and ſo far from accuſing the prevalence of French principles, or the extravagance of French ambition, as inſtrumental to our misfortunes, he never ſpeaks of that abandoned nation without partiality and panegyric. He cannot expect that ſo flimſy an artifice muſt not be ſeen through by every diſcerning man. Every ſuch man knows that his aſſertions and his arguments are equally unfounded; that his Majeſty has, every year ſince his acceſſion, returned thanks to the Legiſlature for the patriotiſm and loyalty of their conduct, and that both Lord Cornwallis and Lord Camden have repeatedly declared (from the Throne) that the diſcomfiture of the diſaffected and rebellious was entirely owing to the virtue, ſpirit, and ſagacity of Parliament. It is well known, that if it was not a good Parliament, it would never paſs the intended Union, which is to be the *ſalvation of the country*, and which, there is very little doubt, will be paſſed by a great majority—notwithſtanding the ſly oppoſition and affected ſupport of ſuch wolves in ſheep's clothing as the author of the pamphlet in queſtion.

But this writer knew very well that his inference

ence was a *non ſequitur*; that in truth the Union is to be conceded to Ireland, becauſe the Parliament is a good one, and deſerves to go to a better place; and that even if the Legiſlature, as he inſinuates, was the cauſe of our misfortunes, it evidently could not improve our condition, to remove theſe repreſentative delinquents into a more remote theatre for the exhibition of their depravity, and give new temptation and opportunity to tranſgreſs at a diſtance from the control and cenſure of their conſtituents. He ſaw plainly that every thinking mind would be ſtruck by the diſproportion of the remedy to the evil, and would of itſelf precipitate into the real concluſion—that ſo abandoned a Legiſlature could only be corrected by radical reform, or complete diſſolution. Thus have I ſatisfactorily proved, in this inſtance, that a concealed United Iriſhman has jeſuitically aſſumed the ſtyle and character of a loyal Engliſhman, who does honour to our country by repreſenting it, for the baſeſt and worſt of purpoſes.

It providentially happens that the beſt concerted and beſt executed fraud cannot long remain undiſcovered, and frequently is the inſtrument of diſcovering itſelf. Thus, reader, it is worth obſerving, how artfully this diſaffected ſcribbler introduces an eulogy upon the French Republic.

Republic. Even the incorporating Union, *which is to be the ſalvation of the country*, he affects to recommend principally upon the example of France, well knowing that this ſalutary meaſure ſtands independently upon its own intrinſic merits, and really ſeeking to depreciate its excellence by putting it upon an improper footing.—*Vide* page 8 of this work, where you may find theſe words:—"*France has not only united to herſelf, and incorporated a great addition of territory, but has rendered abſolutely dependent on her will, almoſt all the ſmaller ſtates which ſurround her.*" Mark the vile and profligate inſinuation, that the conſequence of our Union muſt be an abſolute dependence of Ireland upon the will of England; whereas every unprejudiced man knows that, in fact, an Union is the only thing which can ſecure the independence of Ireland, and enſure the ſalvation of the country. He proceeds—"*Geneva is incorporated, Savoy is incorporated; all the Auſtrian provinces in Flanders, all the German ſtates on this ſide of the Rhine, are incorporated; Spain is ſubject,*" *&c.* It would be diſguſting to tranſcribe more of this nauſeous hypocriſy. The reader has already perceived the drift of it. In the firſt place, it ſeeks, by theſe pretended compariſons, to excite an idle national pride, and to ſuggeſt to Ireland how little her caſe reſembles that of Geneva

neva (which contains about 25,000 inhabitants) or Savoy, or any petty province, or conquered enemy. But Ireland will not be diverted from her great object by ſuch ſilly ſophiſm; ſhe knows her own greatneſs and diſſimilitude to thoſe affronting caricatures, and ſhe adopts the Union upon its own intrinſic merits, and *becauſe it is certainly to be the ſalvation of the country.* The ſecond object is not leſs miſchievous, and indeed it was ſcarcely to be expected that any man could have the audacity to pronounce, even under the maſk of this ſcribe, an exaggerated and fulſome panegyric upon the enemies of his country. We all know very well for what purpoſes certain perſons thought it proper to magnify all the exploits of the French. The invincibility of their troops was a conſtant theme of declamation with the paragraph-writers of the Preſs, and other coadjutors of this pamphleteer, at the time thoſe troops were impatiently expected for the invaſion of this country; and now that the *Great Nation* has been defeated in her attempt to effect *an incorporating Union* with Ireland, the ſame gentry find it expedient to renovate the hopes of their party after the late diſappointment; and the wretch whom I am now employed in detecting, in his pretended recommendation of an Union, abſolutely adopts the cant of French phraſeology, and talks of eſtabliſhing an united empire, *one*

and indiviſible.—Vide page 9. Nor are theſe the only inſtances in which the rebel vocabulary breaks through, and expoſes the hypocrite. In page 11, the gentleman has thought proper to ſay—"*The king of England reſides in another kingdom—the councils of the government of Ireland are framed in the Britiſh cabinet—the government of Ireland is actually adminiſtered by a Britiſh Lord Lieutenant, who diſtributes the patronage of the Crown—the Iriſh Parliament is ſubject to Britiſh influence, and near one million of the rents of this kingdom are annually exported to abſentees—nor can this inconvenience ceaſe whilſt affairs remain as at preſent.*" It ſometimes happens to a man, on hearing particular things, to fancy he has heard them before, and to aſk himſelf, Where did I meet this laſt? Juſt ſo did I feel upon peruſing this paſſage. I rubbed my eyes, but found it was not a dream: for, on taking down an old file of the Preſs, which was my part of the plunder in ranſacking a rebel's houſe as a yeoman, I found not only the ſentiments, but the identical phraſes. The weak argument by which he would thus injure the cauſe of Union is this—that if Engliſh influence at preſent predominates, the tranſplantation of our Legiſlature will remedy the evil; and power, conſequence, and government, will revert into Iriſh channels once more. He knew ſuch an inference could not be ſwallowed by any man at the outſide of Swift's

hoſpital,

hoſpital, and thus, in fact, wounds the cauſe, by an affectation of unſkilfully defending it. He knows it is his premiſes that are falſe, that they are the mere cant and fabrication of the United Iriſhmen, that Engliſh influence does not predominate here, and that, in fact, an Union is made neceſſary by the unpliant and ſtubborn independence of the Iriſh Parliament, as he is forced afterwards to admit and to exemplify by the muliſh reſiſtance in which the ſaid Parliament counteracted the intereſts of the empire upon the queſtions of the Regency, and Commercial Propoſitions.—*Vide page* 12 *and* 13. Every one knows, that after an Union ſuch miſchievous inſtances can never occur again, that this is the real motive for the meaſure, and therefore it was neceſſary for this cunning incendiary to throw duſt in our eyes upon the ſubject. I ſhall no longer, by diſguiſing my ſentiments, follow the example of this ſophiſt, whom I reprobate. I have hitherto hinted my opinion of what he is, and ſhall now boldly avow my ſentiments as to who he is. I have conſulted ſeveral eminent political and literary perſonages, who all agree with me in diſcovering in legible characters the principles and ſtyle of a certain democratic counſellor, the well-known author of *Hurdy Gurdy, and the Old Lion of England*, and who has recently experienced the lenity of Government, in being ſuffered to baniſh himſelf, and, for the ſake of his health, to make Liſbon the ſcene of

his exile. For ſhame, Mr. *Sampſon!* Is this gratitude? Is this honour? Is this a return for the mercy extended to you? And had you no other way of thanking my Lord Cornwallis, than by oppoſing the wiſeſt meaſure of his government, and by making a traveſty and caricature of his Secretary, the vehicle of your malignity? This is one of the many proofs, that rigid and effectual juſtice ought, long ſince, to have been executed upon the author of the pamphlet in queſtion.

It is almoſt below criticiſm to notice the puerile and ſchool-boy allegories, tropes, and metaphors of this author. Such, if a writer was ſerious, might be conſidered as innocent relaxations from reaſoning, and ſometimes happy, though light, illuſtrations of argument; but when a gibing ſatiriſt wiſhes to counteract this great nation in her ſtruggle for ſuch a conſtitutional bleſſing as the Union, it is evident that he muſt intend to ridicule both the country and the meaſure, by comparing her ſucceſſively to the Seven United Provinces, to the Sabines, to a lady going to be married, a trader going into partnerſhip, and an awkward booby commencing his education. To the following paſſage I am not able, with candour, to deny the merit of wit: *If any perſon has a ſon, uneducated, unimproved, and injured by bad habits and bad company, in order to remedy theſe imperfections, would it not be his firſt endeavour to eſtabliſh him*

him in the beſt ſocieties, and introduce him into the moſt virtuous, the moſt poliſhed, and moſt learned company? and if he could once reconcile him to ſuch companies, and teach him to reliſh their converſation, would he not be certain of his ſon's improvement, and of his finally turning out to his credit and ſatisfaction?—(Vide page 8.)—This I admit to be witty, irreſiſtibly amuſing; no gravity can withſtand the idea of Old Ireland going to ſchool to England; but while I pay this juſt tribute to the humour of the writer, I once again, and once for all, proteſt and exclaim againſt the uſe of wit upon ſuch occaſions.—I truſt there is too much good ſenſe, or (as the Right Hon. the Attorney General * ſays) *ſpirit and honour*, in this nation, to be diſguſted, or in any other way diverted, from the great object of an incorporating Union, either by any ludicrous or affrontive ſimilies, or by the affectation of uſing weak and trifling arguments in ſupport of it.—The real argument in ſupport of it ſtands upon a rock, and none but cloven-footed traitors pretend there is any other; I wiſh it was the only, becauſe I am ſure it is the beſt, argument ever advanced upon the ſubject, and that is, *that it will certainly be the ſalvation of the country.*

* Mr. Toler—the gentleman who bullied Napper Tandy:—words perpetually recurring in the law arguments of the above-named gentleman.

Another

Another topic of this work I cannot paſs by with the ſlight cenſure reluctantly impoſed upon pardonable wit and amuſing bagatelle. It is of a more ſerious complexion, and betrays the ſuppreſſed United Iriſhman in every feature. This gentleman affects to recommend the Union (but *non tali auxilio, &c.)*, as if it would preclude the poſſibility of any future rebellion at home, or invaſion from abroad. If we believe him, the *exiſtence of the Iriſh Parliament conſtitutes a diſunited ſtate of the Britiſh empire, which leaves a particular part of it open to the attacks of France; and if that avenue of diſunion ſhould be cloſed, then, &c. &c.—(Vide p.* 9.) Now we all know, that though an Union will certainly be the ſalvation of the nation, yet it is impoſſible that a new modification of a moral relation can produce any change in the phyſical ſituation of the country. Under every poſſible mode of connexion, the coaſt will remain in the ſame geographical poſition as to France; and as to the probability of internal diſſenſion, the fooliſh malecontents of this iſland may, perhaps, be recruited by ſome more fooliſh malecontents, whom this ſalutary meaſure of an Union may diſguſt, in conſequence of ſuch inflammatory productions as the pamphlet in queſtion. Therefore we muſt admit, that though an Union will certainly be the ſalvation of the country, yet it is poſſible, and *in rerum natura*, that after it is accompliſhed there *may be* ſuch a thing as rebellion and invaſion.

What

What then does this Judas mean? Evidently to lull us, and England, into a fatal ſecurity on this important ſubject: to perſuade England of the phyſical impoſſibility of ſuch events, and to give France an opportunity to elude our invincible fleets, and once more annoy our domeſtic peace; but it is impoſſible, I truſt, that the French can be ſo eaſily gulled; they have already ſuffered pretty ſmartly by taking the advice of our author and his auxiliaries; and I appeal to every reaſonable man, whether there is not every probability, that even after an Union the gallant and generous nation of England will make, upon a ſimilar emergency, as great, or nearly as great efforts to ſave this country from invaſion as it did before ſuch an event was in contemplation. As all the Iriſh militia will neceſſarily and *ipſo facto* become Engliſhmen, and the Proteſtants become the majority of our people upon the eſtabliſhment of the Union (vide page 26), it will, of courſe, be uſeleſs to ſend over the Engliſh militia as heretofore, and therefore, probably, that may not be done; but I really cannot ſee why the Engliſh navy ſhould not fail to our aſſiſtance after this deſirable event; we know it did ſo before very effectually: and therefore I think I may juſtly conclude that as an Union was not then found neceſſary to bring the Engliſh navy to our ſuccour, ſo that (as far as men may conjecture about futurity) there is no great probability that there is any thing in an Union

which will make it *impoſſible* for the ſame thing to happen again.

I paſs by the idle and intentionally feeble inference drawn from the preference which the United States of America gave to an incorporating union over a federal one: but, as I paſs, muſt obſerve upon the artifice which this ſly gentleman diſplays in recommending upon all occaſions the example of avowed republicans to this loyal nation. However, let me juſt hint how little analogous the caſes are: in the firſt place, after the ſucceſs of the rebel arms all the States of America ſtarted upon equal terms—no one had any thing to give up to another—there was, therefore, no *ſtratum* for the benefits of an incorporating union; whereas in our caſe Ireland has an independent legiſlature eſtabliſhed for many centuries to ſurrender, and muſt naturally expect the reſulting benefits to be exactly in proportion to the ſacrifice made; and perhaps it is owing to this very circumſtance that America, notwithſtanding all the advantages of an incorporating union, and the interpoſition of the Atlantic, has remained ſubject to French cabal and intrigue, and all the miſchiefs reſulting from them; whereas in Ireland, under all its peculiar circumſtances, an incorporating union will *certainly be the ſalvation of the country*.—This Man in the Maſk has really paſſed by the only national ana-

logy

logy applicable. The caſe of Corſica is preciſely in point. Upon the acquiſition of that iſland in this war, England was weak enough to eſtabliſh a connexion with it upon ſuch federal principles as the preſent connexion with Ireland—an Engliſh Viceroy and Corſican Parliament; and what was the event? The Corſican gem dropped out of the Britiſh Crown almoſt as ſoon as it was ſet there; whereas, had the Union been incorporate, without any Parliament at all, it would certainly, as in Ireland, *have been the ſalvation of the country.*

I know very well what he means by the introduction of Scotland. I know he would ſuggeſt that England is divided from it, as it was from Mercia, by a river, and from Ireland by a ſea; but the fallacy of this dark and malignant inſinuation is plain to the ſimpleſt underſtanding. If the truth be once eſtabliſhed, diſtance cannot affect it. If it be true that an incorporated union is advantageous for countries divided by a river half a mile broad, the addition of another half mile will not alter the moral, though it does the phyſical, poſition. Therefore you may add *ad infinitum*, &c. &c. Q. E. D. But, as the author remarks, example is the beſt of arguments; and what more pregnant example can be conceived than the caſe of America? America was united to England by an incorporated union, that is,

by an Engliſh Government without any Parliament, except that at Weſtminſter; and though the entire Atlantic lay between them, no country was ever more happy or proſperous, or advanced more rapidly in every deſirable improvement, until the unnatural and profligate rebellion which broke out in the provinces, and which ended in their ſeparation from the parent country, and which, if any form of government could have prevented it, would have been that incorporating union, the bleſſings of which ſhe unmeritedly enjoyed. But it is eaſy to know a certain perſon's ſentiments of that unnatural rebellion, who, in page 19, panegyrizes the virtues of Waſhington and the ſagacity of Adams, and who, if the late dreadful rebellion had ſucceeded here, would have ſpoken with equal ſincerity of the virtues of Holt and the ſagacity of O'Connor. —In ſpeaking of Scotland, I know, too, that he would ſuggeſt to our minds diſcouraging ideas; for inſtance, that though Edinburgh has conſiderably improved ſince the Union, yet that the two events ſtand not in the relation of cauſe and effect to each other, and that ſuch a city in the ſame ſpace of time muſt at all events have advanced. This is certainly flimſy; for who can tell what might have been the ſituation of Edinburgh at this day, if there had not been an Union? Moſt probably the luxury that would have been induced by the reſidence of a Court and Legiſla-

ture

ture would long before now have been its deſtruction, and it might at this hour be a heap of ruins.

He alſo muſt have wiſhed to inſinuate that all the avenues of ambition and promotion being fortunately cloſed in Scotland by the Union, Scotſmen are proverbial emigrants, and are obliged to tranſplant themſelves into England, where their ſucceſs in puſhing their fortunes is a ſource of endleſs ridicule and national jealouſy, and where, in ſpite of all their pains in aſſerting themſelves to be Britons and not Scotſmen, the ſurly natives never fail to remind them that they are not Engliſhmen. Why, this is true; but how entirely does the application fail as to Ireland, whoſe natives have always been popular and favourite characters in England. We know no jealouſy ever exiſts in the boſom of an Engliſhman towards an Hibernian; and that the males and females of that liberal nation have always vied in paying compliments to their fortunate neighbours. Neither does the example of Scotland militate againſt our adoption of an Union; for though there have been two rebellions in eighty years, and though, in ſpite of an incorporating union, the French contrived to intrigue there lately, and Muir, Palmer, and others, preached republicaniſm and the pike philoſophy in that happy province, yet we all know that all this

happened AFTER the Union; whereas, in Ireland, the Union being ſubſequent to ſuch miſfortunes, muſt completely extinguiſh the poſſibility of their revival, and *be in every ſenſe the ſalvation of the country.*

I come now to the moſt unprincipled part of this work. Every body knows that one of the ſtrongeſt and moſt unanſwerable arguments in favour of an Union is, that it muſt of neceſſity extinguiſh all religious animoſities, and for ever ſilence the diſcordance of ſectarious conflicts.—For inſtance, it is obvious that the Catholics can never hereafter complain of not participating in the conſtitution, becauſe there will be no conſtitution for them to participate in; and that they will have nothing to aſk from their Proteſtant brethren, becauſe their Proteſtant brethren will have nothing to give them; and, on the other hand, the Proteſtants can have no alarm leſt their privileges ſhould be taken from them, when they will have nothing to be robbed of.—This equitable and natural compoſition of claims, which otherwiſe muſt have claſhed in endleſs diſcord, has, almoſt without an exception, reconciled both parties in a common unanimity of approbation, to a meaſure which, demonſtrably, *will be the ſalvation of the country.* But how does this abandoned hireling of a deſperate faction endeavour to diſtort this happy cir-

cumſtance, and fruſtrate ſo deſirable a conſummation?

Forſooth he laments, with hypocritical quotation, in page 22, *that it is a conſummation devoutly to be wiſhed, but never to be expected*; and, in order to tear open and feſter the gaping wounds of his languiſhing country, he labours to diſguſt both religions againſt the Union, by affecting to repreſent it as excluſively advantageous to each.—He argues, that each religion is to be bettered at the expenſe of the other, and that both muſt gain, becauſe each muſt loſe. To the Catholic he affects to ſay, While the preſent order of things continues, the Proteſtant aſcendancy muſt be maintained;—there is no getting rid of it—the King's Coronation Oath—the Teſt Laws—the Conſtitution in Church and State—all ſtand in your way; Government wiſh to ſerve you, but the Conſtitution is a Gordian knot of difficulties, and there is no way but cutting it aſunder. What will ſignify an Iriſh Act of Parliament, if the Iriſh Parliament itſelf is out of the way?—His Majeſty can have no further ſcruples about his oath, when his Iriſh Parliament have made free with theirs. In an Union all difficulties will vaniſh, and then who knows what the King and Britiſh Parliament may hereafter do for you?—This is a juſt paraphraſe of the topics he addreſſes inſidiouſly to the Catholics—for this very purpoſe,

poſe, that they ſhould ſee the tendency of his ſophiſms, and be prejudiced againſt that Union, *which is to be the ſalvation of the country.* To the Proteſtants he ſays, The Catholics are the majority now; nothing but an Union can make them the minority: for though four Catholic Iriſhmen are more numerous than one Proteſtant Iriſhman, yet, if to the latter you add ten Proteſtant Engliſhmen, the Proteſtant Iriſhmen will then exceed the Catholic Iriſhmen, in the proportion of eleven to four. Haſten, then, to work this ſum, and avail yourſelves of political arithmetic—Beſides, your True Blue politics are going out of faſhion—(*Vide* page 52)—*Who will be a guarantee of that ſyſtem, and whom will it content? The Catholics will not acquieſce in its propriety—A party of Proteſtants in Ireland term it unjuſt and abſurd—Another party in England term it by fouler names; great leaders in Oppoſition, poſſibly the future Miniſters of England, may condemn it, and ſome members of the Britiſh Cabinet are ſuppoſed to be adverſe to it. Its ſtability may depend upon accident, upon the death of a ſingle character, upon the change of a Miniſter, or the temper of a Lord Lieutenant. The policy of this ſyſtem is much doubted by the people of England; and while your Parliament exiſts, you are never ſecure againſt ſuch contingencies.*—And again, in p. 26—*Great Britain is not pledged upon any ſpecific principle to ſupport one ſect in Ireland more than another—I know not by what tie ſhe is debarred from aſſiſting*

the

the Catholics, while the kingdoms remain ſeparate—that is, in other words, perhaps in the next rebellion, the Engliſh may join the Catholics againſt the Proteſtants. No compariſon is too ludicrous for ſuch traſh as this; and, indeed, I am fatigued with ſerious reſentment againſt ſuch abſurd profligacy. It is like an old ſinner clapping two boys on the back, to make them break each other's heads, while he runs away with the prize for which they contend. It is like a fraudulent groom-porter proclaiming the odds in favour of one gambler, while he whiſpers them in favour of the other; or a ſharper looking over and adviſing one hand, while he is making ſigns on his fingers to the adverſary. It is impudently, and for diſaffected purpoſes, repreſenting Government as an auctioneer, ſetting the bleſſings of an Union up to a puff-auction, threatening the Proteſtants that they will be outbid by the Catholics, and the Catholics, that the Proteſtants will get the market; and preſumptuouſly imputing to Lord Cornwallis's adminiſtration the abominable and Machiavelian principle of *divide & impera*, which is in reality the badge of the United Iriſhmen, and other confederates of that audacious pamphleteer.—A gang of ſwindlers in London (a place notorious for ſuch gentry) hired an alley which communicated from one public ſtreet to another. At each end ſtood one of the gang, and vociferated—

"*Walk*

"*Walk in to the auction; great bargains—walk in to the auction!*" The deluded paſſengers, who were quietly going the broad way to St. Paul's cathedral, liſtened to the voice of the charmer, and ſtepped in; while, at the other ſide, the equally deluded crowd, going through Ave-Maria-lane, did the ſame. What was the conſequence? They knocked their heads together in the dark, and the remainder of the robbers picked the pockets of both. Such would be the deſpicable images juſtly applicable to the Britiſh nation and cabinet, if this ſhameleſs ſcribbler was a true repreſentative of their ſentiments; but we know very well the magnanimity of that nation and cabinet in conceding this Union to Ireland, *which is to be the ſalvation of the country*, and we will not be inflamed by ſuch ſcandalous miſrepreſentation.—We know that Government is incapable of ſuch monſtrous and depraved duplicity as to ſay to the Catholics, Emancipation can never be granted till there is an Union; and to ſay to the Proteſtants, Emancipation can never be refuſed till there is an Union. In the treating of this topic, the rebel blood breaks out in ſpite of every concealment. *Vide* page 19. The old inflammatory topic is put forward, that *nine-tenths of the property of Ireland are in the hands of Britiſh deſcendants, and that theſe Proteſtants, thus poſſeſſing nine-tenths of the property, are only one-fourth of the inhabitants in number, and have been obliged to rely upon*

Britiſh

Britiſh aſſiſtance for the preſervation of their property and exiſtence. This once more, as in a former paſſage, ſuggeſts to the Catholic Iriſh the deſperate project which the United Iriſhmen have ever proclaimed as the only chance of recovering their rights—a ſeparation from England; and yet the ſame man who urges this argument of the Catholic numbers as concluſive upon the occaſion, affects in another paſſage to recommend an Union upon the ſpecific merits of its annihilating that argument altogether.—Vide page 26. In the event of an Union *the Catholics would loſe the advantage of the argument of numbers, which they at preſent enjoy.* But, alas! this is not mere nonſenſe—human wickedneſs is equal to ſuch a flight, though human folly is not. The ſophiſt well knew, that the inferences founded upon the numbers of the Catholics are no more affected by the numbers of the Engliſh Proteſtants than by the number of Dutch, Swiſs, or American Proteſtants; and that, before and after an Union, whether the Engliſh nation were Jews, Turks, or Anabaptiſts, the Catholics *in Ireland* would continue the majority of the people; and all arguments and expectations drawn from that fact, whether juſtly or otherwiſe, remain preciſely as before. But this is neither more nor leſs than a hint to the diſaffected part of the Catholics, to turn this ſophiſm to their own purpoſes. It teaches them to ſay, If we are the minority of the empire, the danger of our claims, which re-

ſults from our numbers, and with which you alarm the Proteſtant, vaniſhes; and if we are the majority, you eſtabliſh our right to emancipation upon the very ſame principle that you eſtabliſh the rights of the Proteſtants. Vide page 23. *Every ſtate ought to eſtabliſh that religious ſect which is moſt numerous.*

In page 53, already cited, among other dangers incident to the Proteſtant intereſt, while the legiſlatures remain ſeparate, we find that its ſtability may reſt upon accident, upon the death of a *ſingle* character. The word *ſingle* is printed in italics. Reader, reſtrain your indignation when this is explained to you. It is generally conceived, in conſequence of the miſrepreſentations of the United Iriſhmen, that his preſent Majeſty is hoſtile to a further emancipation of the Iriſh Catholics, but that the Heir Apparent to the crown entertains different ſentiments upon that ſubject. Obſerve, then, this incendiary, with affected zeal for the eſtabliſhed religion, running the King's life againſt the Proteſtant aſcendancy, but, in reality, ſuggeſting to the Catholics the ſhort cut to the accompliſhment of their wiſhes. It required more than ordinary preſumption to introduce into a work, affecting to recommend that meaſure *which is to be the ſalvation of the country*, the blaſted aſſaſſination principles of the Union Star, and to point out the beloved father of his people to his loyal ſubjects as

an

an obſtacle to their proſpects, which only can be removed by the termination of his life. Indeed the miſchievous principle which pervades the whole work is (to uſe a colloquial expreſſion) *the putting bad things into one's head*, under the ſubtle pretence of doing general good. It reminds me of a familiar, though innocent illuſtration. Some college ſtudents were inflicting the diſcipline of the pump upon one of thoſe unpopular characters called a bailiff, who had been detected in violating the academic ſanctuary. A ſenior fellow, who was a *ſpectator* of the puniſhment, and who, though bound to enforce collegiate decorum, entertained the uſual antipathy to the ſheriff's officer, exclaimed, "Fye, lads, don't be cruel, don't nail the man's ear to the pump." The youths, who had not before thought of this improvement, thanked the preceptor for his hint, and the unhappy victim was accordingly affixed to the inſtrument of his diſgrace."

In page 31 occurs a paſſage worthy of obſervation:—"*It does not follow, that if an Union were made, that the government of Ireland would be leſs vigilantly adminiſtered; it would probably be adminiſtered with more attention, becauſe it would be leſs diſtracted by the buſineſs of party and of parliament, and for the ſame reaſon it would be adminiſtered more impartially.*" In the firſt place, this is a malignant and ſlanderous calumny againſt Government in

general, and not merely inſinuates, but proclaims that Government hitherto has not only not been adminiſtered vigilantly and impartially, but has been *diſtracted*. In that general ſlander is alſo included much private defamation of Major Sirr, Inſpector Shee, Mr. Gregg, the gaoler of Newgate, Mr. Juſtice Swan, and other active and cool officers in the executive department. Secondly, it impudently aſſerts that ſuch the miſconduct and frenzy of Government is owing to that very patriotic Parliament which is about to paſs a meaſure for *the ſalvation of the country*; and thirdly, it ſeeks to inflame and ſtir up the good people of England againſt their Legiſlature, by advancing an argument which, if puſhed, would conclude againſt the exiſtence of all Parliaments whatſoever, and at once demonſtrate the pre-eminent ſuperiority of an abſolute monarchy, not diſturbed by any *diſtractions* but its own. This ſophiſt well knew the maxim, "he who proves too much proves nothing;" and with affected ſimplicity expoſes himſelf to the application of it. But, in truth, it is very poſſible that the mixed government may be beſt for England, and the pure executive for Ireland. However, though it were to be admitted that the liberty of the ſubject is ſecured by the reſponſibility which the executive owes to the legiſlative, yet the Britiſh executive, who will hereafter govern this country, *undiſtracted* by an Iriſh Parliament, being compoſed of men of honour,

nour, they will find themſelves bound in honour to feel that reſponſibility increaſed, in proportion to the diſtance at which it reſides; and therefore, in fact, the principles of the Iriſh Conſtitution, moving in an orbit more remote from the focus of the prerogative, will be attracted thereto in the increaſed ratio of their own centrifugal force. Beſides, if hereafter any ill-adviſed Lord Lieutenant ſhould be tempted to make any unconſtitutional attempt in his government, a direct appeal can be made upon the ſubject, with a reaſonably fair wind, to the Parliament of the empire, in about four days; and as, from the increaſed numbers of imperial ſenators, there will be much more time for public buſineſs than formerly, there may be always expected a debate, and ſatisfactory determination, upon the ſubject, to be known in Ireland (wind and weather ſtill permitting) in about ten days more, unleſs it ſhould unfortunately happen to be the time of the Seſſion allotted for Meaſures of Finance, or Engliſh Turnpike Bills: and in the interval, whatever little encroachment has been made by the prerogative, will only have been *de bene eſſe*; and the ſame inſtance will probably not recur, ſoon after the law has been ſettled upon the ſubject.

In page 48, this diſaffected man almoſt openly charges Government with taking advantage of a ſeaſon of war and confuſion, to force an

Union upon the Iriſh people; whereas, in truth, that very circumſtance demonſtrates the magnanimity of Great Britain, inaſmuch as the greater are our calamities, the greater is our neceſſity for a meaſure which is to be *the ſalvation of the country*.—But mark the manner of this ſlander. *As to a time of war, it is true that the Volunteers took advantage of the embarraſſments of Great Britain in the laſt war, to aſſert the independence of our Parliament. It is likewiſe true, that the United Iriſhmen in the preſent war have taken advantage of the ſuppoſed weakneſs of Great Britain, to play the game of ſeparation. When, therefore, enemies of the empire take advantage of a time of war and embarraſſment to effect its ruin, we ſhould turn againſt them their own game, and make uſe of a time of war, to eſtabliſh its ſecurity.* What is this, but to ſay the Volunteers were no better than the United Iriſhmen, and that Lord Cornwallis's government is as bad as either of them? Obſerve the generalſhip of this maſterly poſition: he poſts his favourite corps, the United Iriſhmen, in the centre, and flanks them with the Volunteers, and Lord Cornwallis's adminiſtration. He knows too how popular the memory of the Volunteers is with all loyal ſubjects in the country, and that the Lord Chancellor, and all the great officers of ſtate, are proud to have belonged, in their youth, to that immortal aſſociation; and yet, in ſo many words, he ſtyles them *the enemies of the empire, who took advantage of a*

time

time of war and embarraſſment, to effect its ruin. Can the views of this diſguiſed traitor be any longer diſguiſed?

In the ſame manner that he has hallooed the Proteſtants againſt the Catholics, in the hopes of their joining in a common cry againſt the ſalutary meaſure which is to be *the ſalvation of the country*, has he endeavoured to commit all the claſſes of ſociety in pernicious jealouſies againſt each other, the Lawyer againſt the Merchant, the Man of Landed Property againſt both the Clergy and the Diſſenters, and the Dublin Citizen againſt the Inhabitant of Cork. To all theſe ſeveral deſcriptions he ſucceſſively affects to demonſtrate their peculiar and excluſive advantages, at the expenſe of all the reſt, in the corrupt expectation of uniting them all (as I foreſee will be the caſe) in one common oppoſition to the meaſure. This man, for his own abandoned purpoſes, would ſet the two breaſts on the ſame boſom againſt each other. *To demonſtrate* (ſays he) *to the Clergy the advantage of an Union, would be loſt labour indeed. (Vide p.* 37.) And yet (*in page* 56) he affects to give as the 8th Article of the Union, an *arrangement* with reſpect to tithes. We all know what an *arrangement* that factious crew to which he belongs would make in that reſpect. He wiſhes to diſguſt the Rebels againſt an Union, which is to be ſo advantageous to the Clergy, and to terrify the Clergy

from

from a meaſure which is to be accompanied by an arrangement with regard to tithes. One would ſuppoſe he did not expect any one would read his whole pamphlet, but that each part would be ſtudied by thoſe it was intended to miſlead. In one and the ſame page (32), he affects to conciliate the Diſſenters, by urging inducements irreconcileably contradictory. They too, like the Catholics, are to be appeaſed with a burnt-offering of tithes; they too, like the Proteſtants, are to be reinforced numerically, by the acceſſion of Scotch and Engliſh Diſſenters; and yet in the ſame page they are told, that the inevitable conſequence of the meaſure muſt be the annihilation of their ſect, and their neceſſary merging in the maſs of the Proteſtants. The author knew that no man writing in a ſtrain of ſuch profligate inconſiſtency could be ſuppoſed to be in earneſt; and he adviſedly at once ſubjects the meaſure of an Union to reprobation, and the defence of it to ridicule. In *page* 33, the Temporal Peers are inſidiouſly reminded, that nothing will be left to them but their properties; and are inſultingly informed, that being allowed to retain their properties, will be more than a compenſation for the loſs of their conſequence; while the Spiritual Peers are told, that *they will be amply recompenſed by the ſecurity given to their Diocеſan Eſtates, and to the general intereſts of the Church:* and what is that ſecurity? and what are thoſe intereſts?—That deſertion of the Proteſtant

teſtant intereſt, and that arrangement of tithes, which are promiſed to the Catholics and Diſſenters as the reward of their acquieſcence. It is eaſy to ſee that the ſame unprincipled attempt is made in the paſſage addreſſed to Country Gentlemen, and that they are ſcarcely mentioned in the pamphlet except for the purpoſe of invidious claſſification, and of ſhowing them their intereſts as contradiſtinguiſhed from the profeſſion of the law and the mercantile community; whereas, in truth, all ranks, trades, and profeſſions are equally concerned in this momentous meaſure.

To the merchants the Author evidently inſinuates, with his characteriſtic artifice, that none of the expected commercial advantages are neceſſarily connected with an Union, and that in the preſent ſyſtem of connexion a liberal and honeſt policy on the part of England would communicate this participation of privileges as effectually as under any other modification of the relation between the two countries. This is evident by the inſinuations in pages 38, 39, and 40, that the Engliſh will never conſume Iriſh corn, until there is a Union; that unleſs that meaſure takes place they will never make uſe of the great canals which they have extended to Liverpool and other weſtern ports, but, like the dog in the manger, will deny the enjoyment of theſe benefits both to us and themſelves. This nonſenſe

could never have been written with any view but that of fomenting national jealouſy, and repreſenting the magnanimous nation of England as a monſter of mean injuſtice and cruel illiberality. This nonſenſe would repreſent our generous neighbours buying our Conſtitution with their Commerce, commuting their ſubſtantial advantages for our illuſory pride, and content to injure themſelves, provided they degrade us; whereas every one knows the reverſe to be true. It is well underſtood and univerſally believed that the Engliſh have long determined upon the moſt liberal equalization of the commercial privileges of both nations; that ſuch an event is by no means dependent upon the meaſure of an Union, but concurrent with it; and that the only reaſon for making the two circumſtances cotemporary is, the wiſh of heaping favour upon favour, till the compliment overpowers us.

This reſervation of the one boon until it can be accompanied by the other is evidently the dignified and munificent intention of Great Britain; and as nothing manifeſts an handſome intention ſo much as a handſome manner, it particularly appears from the guarded and delicate ſilence preſerved upon the quantity, degree, and nature of the commercial bleſſings in reſerve for us; not affronting this great nation by a mean numerical detail of paltry items, but enveloping the be-

neſice in an indefinite myſteriouſneſs, ſo as to take us by ſurpriſe, and confound us, as it were, by the magnitude of advantages which we had no opportunity of calculating. It is important, therefore, that this unfortunate ſcribe ſhould not be ſuffered to miſrepreſent this matter. Indeed, wicked as his inſinuations are, they have not the merit of originality: I remember on the debate of the Iriſh Propoſitions in the Engliſh Houſe of Commons, another factious character, Mr. Fox, ſaid with epigrammatic affectation, *I would not give the Commerce of England for the Conſtitution of Ireland: it is not the thing I wiſh to purchaſe, nor the price I wiſh to pay.* This fooliſh and reprobated notion of compromiſe, where there is nothing but munificence on one hand and gratitude on the other, is adopted by the pamphleteer, but, I truſt, is now ſufficiently expoſed. The rational Iriſh merchant knows that the Union is *to be the ſalvation of the country*, and that is as much as he wiſhes to know about it. The opinion I have here combated is preſſed by the enemies of both nations for obvious purpoſes. The benefits to be acquired by an Union muſt be either ſuch as are obtained by compact between the countries, or ſuch as are the natural operation and reſult of the meaſure itſelf. Now in this caſe the advantages to be contracted for, whether for Dublin, Cork, Waterford, Limerick, or Galway, are altogether out of the queſ-

tion, inaſmuch as they are all equally attainable under the preſent connexion; and as the two countries are already imperially connected, there could be no honeſt or rational motive aſſignable, why they are not at preſent imparted (eſpecially as ſuch benefits could continue only while the connexion exiſts), except the generoſity of Britain wiſhing to make each kindneſs more valuable, by giving them all at once. But becauſe that deſcription of advantage is out of the queſtion, we always hear of it from the enemies of the meaſure, who entirely overlook, or affect to do ſo, the benefits which naturally reſult from the meaſure itſelf, which flow from the mere fact of Union, and are created ſimply by the transfer of legiſlation. It would be uſeleſs to detail the particulars of ſuch benefits; honourable confidence has already given credit for them, and ſceptical incredulity is proof againſt conviction. A few of thoſe which the tranſplantation of Parliament muſt inſtantly, *and of itſelf*, generate, are, the total oblivion of all religious animoſities, the immediate converſion and repentance of the United Iriſhmen, the multiplication of the Proteſtants, and conſequent ſatisfaction of the Catholics, the ruſh and influx of Engliſh capital into this peaceful and contented country, the improvement of agriculture, by the brotherly and edifying intercourſe of Engliſh and Iriſh farmers, the diminution of abſentees and taxes, the reduction of an

expenſive

expenſive ſtanding army, the improvements of the metropolis, peace with the French, and glory with the world!—Theſe are a but few of the bleſſings neceſſarily connected with the ſimple fact of changing the ſeat of legiſlation—bleſſings innumerable, and which only can be deſcribed by ſaying, *that the meaſure muſt be the ſalvation of the country.*

I am ſorry to find that it is not unneceſſary to caution this credulous country againſt the artifice of this diſaffected hypocrite: I lament, that ſince theſe ſheets were begun, his ſubtle and malignant poiſon has taken effect in one member of the national body. I lament that a deſcription of men, whom I reſpect ſo much as the Bar of Ireland, has not been able to reſiſt the infection, and I have the vanity to regret, that they had irreparably erred, before this publication could appear, to warn them of their danger.—However, my reſentment to the dupes merges in my ſuperior indignation againſt the impoſtor, and candour compels me to remember, that if it were not for the audacious pamphlet in queſtion, moſt probably 166 Iriſh lawyers would never have diſgraced their profeſſion and themſelves by publicly denouncing to the nation a meaſure which *is to be the ſalvation of the country.* This libeller knew the ſtrings upon which to touch the profeſſion, and by affecting

to

to repreſent their poſſible objections to an Union as frivolous, has, in reality, made them the ſubject of the livelieſt anxiety and irritation. Thirty-two * independent and public-ſpirited characters have certainly reſcued the Bar from univerſal opprobrium; they may be conſidered by an ominous coincidence of numbers as ſo many county repreſentatives, and in that reſpect as ſpeaking *(ex cathedra)* the ſentiment of the kingdom: but it is melancholy to ſee the extended corruption of 166 men, all influenced by the expectation of ſitting in Parliament, and deſperately monopolizing more than half the repreſentation of the people, and upon this baſe and ſelfiſh principle refiſting the *ſalvation of their country.* God knows there were lawyers enough before in the Houſe of Commons, as the writer truly has ſtated (page 35), *a formidable phalanx.* Of our 300 members there are no leſs than 17 practiſing barriſters, and at leaſt a dozen more, who, though they never followed the trade, were bred to that unconſtitutional profeſſion. This is bad enough; but no honeſt Iriſhman can be ſufficiently grateful for the prevention of 166 more from ſitting in the next Parliament. It is lamentable to ſee the beſt and moſt reſpectable characters ſtoop before the idols of ambition.

* There are thirty-two counties in Ireland, to each of which the Lord Lieutenant appoints an aſſiſtant barriſter, with a ſalary of 400*l.* per annum.

Even

Even Mr. Saurin, who, during Lord Camden's * adminiſtration, was in his cool ſenſes, and refuſed the office of Solicitor General and a ſeat in Parliament, has ſuffered his quiet and ſober intellect to be inflamed by the artful inſinuations of this rebel in diſguiſe, and has for ever loſt his reputation with his country and profeſſion—and for what? For the idle ſpeculation of ſitting at the head of 166 lawyers in the next Houſe of Commons. This paſſage in the pamphlet was intended for more than the Bar. The author ſlily reminds us (page 34) that it is the habit of Iriſh gentlemen to educate their ſons as lawyers, and by this hint that there is ſcarcely a gentleman's family in the kingdom which has not ſome dear connexion in the profeſſion. He hopes to engage the whole claſs of our gentry in one common reſentment with thoſe whom he excluſively appears to inflame, while he makes ſure of the indignation of both by one round aſſertion (page 35), That what is *bad for the Bar muſt of neceſſity be good for the country*. Another moſt deep, and, indeed, ingenious ſcheme, in order to deter the Bar from an Union, is a poſitive denunciation, that, in the event of an Union, there will

* That Nobleman was weak enough to treat the profeſſion of the law with reſpect, and their armed aſſociation with affection; but the more vigorous intellect which diſtinguiſhes the adminiſtration of his ſucceſſor has appreciated the Bar and the Yeomanry with more juſtice.

be

be *abler* Judges upon the Bench than at preſent. *Vide* page 35. This had the deſired effect with Mr. Saurin, Mr. Duquery, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Plunket, and ſome other Iriſh ſmatterers in law. This was an evil, the proſpect of which they could not bear. They find it eaſy now to humbug Lords Kilwarden and Carleton, and Judges Downes, Chamberlaine, Smith, and George *. They can hoodwink Lord Yelverton at Niſi Prius; and in Equity the facility and ſoftneſs of Lord Clare is ſo proverbial, that the loweſt attornies daily outwit and overreach him. But there would be an end to this hopeful trade, if the Bench were filled with *abler* Judges, as in the event of an Union, from the ſuperior learning of the Engliſh Bar, there is every probability it would.

The notion of *young adventurers who have little ſtake in the country, but a facility of ſpeaking on every ſubject* (page 35), was not intended to affront the Bar, as might at firſt appear, but to excite their emulation, and ſtimulate their ambition; and it unfortunately has had the deſired effect. The Bar muſt have obſerved inſtances of young adven-

* Theſe perſons are ſuppoſed to be adverſe to the Union; and it is remarkable that the four laſt obtained their ſeats on the Bench, not through parliamentary influence, but from their profeſſional character.

turers

turers * from another nation, who had *no* ſtake in this country, or any other, and *no* facility of ſpeaking upon any ſubject, but merely a facility of writing (and that too with *clerical* errors) upon ſome ſubjects, who yet contrived to riſe from the loweſt to the higheſt ſituations; and they inferred, that they were not excluded from ſuch pretenſions, merely becauſe they are gentlemen by birth and education.

The truth is incontrovertible, though it appears in the pamphlet in queſtion, and that is, that the Bar are too fond of politics. Shortly before the French came to Bantry Bay, the Bar, in a political fury, took up arms, which they have not *yet* laid down; and, under the vain idea of defending the country, they not only waſted their own time, but inſpired all over the kingdom a ſimilar and general idleneſs. In the time of the rebellion this miſchief was at its height, and no man could get his buſineſs out of the hands of a lawyer. He was never to be found at home, but indulging upon guard, or diſſipating in camp; and I am convinced, if, for near ſix months, the attornies had not been equally indolent, that the complaints of clients would have been innumerable. But this, though inconvenient to others, was, moſt

* Suppoſed to mean the author of the pamphlet in favour of the Union.

of all, inconvenient to the United Iriſhmen; and hence the reſentment and venom of this hackney ſcribe.—*Hinc illæ lacrymæ.* However, I truſt, the Bar will come to their ſenſes, though for a moment led away by this profligate ſophiſt. I truſt they will, even if againſt their own intereſt, concur heartily in a meaſure which *muſt be the ſalvation of the country.* But even their moſt ſelfiſh intereſts, in my apprehenſion, muſt be promoted by an Union. The Iriſh gentlemen, who will emigrate for the good of their country, muſt borrow money to ſupport the expenſe of Engliſh living, upon mortgages of their Iriſh property. This muſt multiply foreclоſure cauſes; and the increaſe of ejectments, and other actions for non-payment of rent in the city of Dublin, will be incalculable.

I paſs by, with contempt, the inſinuation in page 39, that this popular meaſure is, in the city of Dublin, to be ſupported by force, as *being the head-quarters of the army.* The city of Dublin will derive more benefits from this meaſure than my ſhort limits will ſuffer me to enumerate. Its beauty (to mention but one inſtance) will be conſiderably contributed to by the deſirable introduction of *rus in urbe* in ſeveral parts of it. This, together with the aſcertained advantage which Dublin muſt derive,

after

after the Union, by getting rid, altogether, of that riotous and troubleſome deſcription of men, the manufacturers in the Earl of Meath's liberty, demonſtrates, that, in ſpite of this flagitious firebrand's inſinuations, this city will be benefited by an Union as much as Cork or Waterford, or any other place in the kingdom. I touch, with equal contempt, upon the crafty hint, that Parliament is incompetent to its own diſſolution. He repeats the ſophiſm of Rouſſeau in defence of ſuicide—That reaſon being given to man to achieve happineſs, he has a right to deſtroy himſelf whenever it tells him that death is preferable to life. He knows that deluſive argument was eaſily anſwered by Rouſſeau himſelf, and therefore urges it as a mock defence for what he hints to be a political ſuicide. The object of Parliament, ſays he, is general good.—Now, if general good is attainable by ſelf-deſtruction—*ergo*, &c. &c. This would be very ſchoolboyiſh if it was not very wicked.

This topic is (upon the plan of the work) ſtrongly enforced, by being weakly combated;—one example is worth a dozen arguments.—In the reign of Oliver Cromwell, the Long Parliament perpetuated itſelf by a vote.—Hiſtory informs us of the good conſequences of that meaſure.—Of courſe, *à multo fortiori*, if Parliament has a right to perpetuate, it has a right to

deſtroy itſelf. I ſhall conclude now with two remarks:

1ſt. This infamous production labours to eſtabliſh one propoſition—That no man can agree to an Union, unleſs impelled to do ſo by the moſt abject fear, or moſt abandoned corruption; whereas, in truth, all good men concur in their approbation of it, upon the moſt enlarged conviction (independent and regardleſs of all paltry detail), *that the meaſure will be the ſalvation of the country.*

2d. That there is demonſtration of the utility of the meaſure, from one circumſtance—That during the ſucceſſive reigns of various Viceroys, no Engliſh Secretary had ever the public ſpirit to propoſe this important revolution, but that as ſoon as an amiable young Nobleman of our own nation aſſumed the reins of government, the firſt meaſure of his adminiſtration was *the ſalvation of his country.*

Lord Caſtlereagh, uninfluenced by the ſelfiſh examples of his Engliſh predeceſſors, felt the Iriſh blood running in his veins, and determined it ſhould never bluſh in his face; his country and poſterity will do him juſtice *.

* I hate old proverbs and vulgar adages.—One moſt illiberal one is contradicted by this Nobleman's conduct—that "if you put an Iriſhman on a ſpit, you can always get another to turn him."

The pamphlet I have anſwered, I do not heſitate to pronounce the moſt audacious, profligate, and libellous production, which ever diſgraced the licentiouſneſs of the preſs, or inſulted the feelings of a nation.—A bad head and a bad heart muſt have concurred to compoſe it, and the moſt unbluſhing and unfeeling effrontery alone was equal to the publication of it.—I rely upon the wiſdom and ſpirit of the Britiſh Parliament, in which my country is ſo ſoon to be repreſented, not to ſuffer it to eſcape with impunity; and I truſt one of the firſt motions made in the Imperial Legiſlature may be—"That his Majeſty's Attorney-General, "the Right Hon. John Toler, or Capt. Taylor, "the Lord-Lieutenant's Aid-de-Camp, may be "ordered to proſecute the author, printer, and "publiſher of the ſaid libel, by indictment, in-"formation, or court-martial, as the circum-"ſtances of the caſe may require."

THE END.

New Publications printed for J. DEBRETT.

ARGUMENTS FOR and AGAINST AN UNION between GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND considered; 2d edition; price 1s. 6d.

Mr. JEBB's REPLY to a Pamphlet, entitled, "Arguments for and againſt an Union." 1s. 6d.

Sir J. W. JERVIS's LETTER on the Inexpediency of a Fœderal Union between the Two Kingdoms. 1s. 6d.

REPORTS of the SECRET COMMITTEES of both HOUSES of PARLIAMENT in IRELAND on the REBELLION of that Kingdom, Aug. 30, 1798; with Appendixes. Price 5s. 6d.

A COLLECTION of the moſt celebrated TRACTS on the propoſed COMMERCIAL REGULATIONS with IRELAND; in 1 large vol. 8vo. 15s. boards.

OBSERVATIONS on the MANUFACTURES, TRADE, and preſent STATE of IRELAND. By JOHN Lord SHEFFIELD. Third edition; 7s. boards.

*** This work includes the important queſtion relative to the opening the Ports of Great Britain to the Manufactures of Ireland, and alſo the Colonial and Foreign Produce of that Kingdom.

An Impartial SKETCH of the DEBATE in the HOUSE of COMMONS of IRELAND, on a Motion made on Friday, Aug. 12, 1785, by the Right Hon. THOMAS ORDE, for Leave to bring in a Bill for effectuating the Intercourſe and Commerce between Great Britain and Ireland, on permanent and equitable Principles, for the mutual Benefit of both Countries: together with an impartial Sketch of the principal Speeches on the Subject of the Bill, that were delivered in the Houſe on Monday, Aug. 15, 1785; with a Copy of the Bill preſented to the Houſe of Commons of Ireland, of the eleven Iriſh Propoſitions, of the twenty Reſolutions of the Britiſh Parliament, the Addreſs of both Houſes of that Parliament to the King, and his Majeſty's Anſwer. By WILLIAM WOODFALL. 4s.

The SPEECH of Sir JOHN SINCLAIR, Bart. M. P. &c. on the Bill for impoſing a Tax upon Income, in the Debate on that Bill on Friday the 14th of December 1798. Price 6d.

OBSERVATIONS on the Political STATE of the CONTINENT, ſhould France be ſuffered to retain her immenſe Acquiſitions; in which is reviewed her whole Syſtem of Aggrandizement, and the probable Advantages which ſhe will derive from the Subverſion of Italy and the Poſſeſſion of Belgium, on the Return of Peace. Price 3s. 6d.